

**EXHIBIT 100 TO
HARVEY DECLARATION
REDACTED VERSION**

From: Laszlo Bock <laszlo@google.com> on behalf of Laszlo Bock
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 2:25 AM
To: Paul Otellini
Cc: Eric Schmidt; Shona Brown; John Doerr
Subject: Re: the FT article

Paul,

Sorry for the confusion here! We definitely heard you and believe we implemented your feedback!

There are two issues at play: our LDCC discussion where your concerns were quite clear, and the FT's erroneous calculation of the increase in pay for SVPs, without the benefit of having full information. The latter is the root cause, as the FT doesn't know that we're eliminating the Company Multiplier, so most of the "increase" is just shifting from Multiplier to target bonus for the named SVPs, but of course that's not transparent to the FT.

YOUR CONCERNS ABOUT CASH COMPENSATION

Your comments focused on the table on page 5 of the LDCC document (attached). [REDACTED]

You were very uncomfortable with the effect of keeping our current Individual Performance payout curve and historic performance ratings, which we projected would [REDACTED] (11th column from left ...

Redacted

We all agreed to [REDACTED]

The approved detail was:

[REDACTED]

FT ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN SVP PAY

[REDACTED]

For SVPs, the reconciliation to the FT's math is:

[REDACTED]

For our internal discussions, we compared (2) and (3), which is [REDACTED] in pay for SVPs (see page 5 of doc).

The FT, not having the benefit of understanding that we've rolled our Company Multiplier into salaries, instead compared (1) and (3), which is [REDACTED].

Paul, I hope this is helpful. Please feel free to call my cell phone on 650-452-4967 if it's helpful to walk through this live.

Best,
Laszlo

Best,
Laszlo

On Mon, Nov 15, 2010 at 5:10 PM, Otellini, Paul <paul.otellini@intel.com> wrote:

I was very surprised to see that the FT wrote that our regulatory filings had the "million dollar raises for execs" in them. Recall that I objected to this in the meeting and I came away hearing that you would modify the bonus such that we did not signal this level of compensation increase, nor were we prepared to deliver increases to execs in the 2-4X range of the rank and file. Can one of you tell me what went wrong here? Or is my memory on this wrong? Thanks,
Paul